## REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated January 24, 2006. In the amendment, claims 10 and 28-32 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-14, 16-19, and 24-27 have been amended such that claims 1-6, 9, 11-14, 16-20 and 22-27 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims in light of this amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 10-12, 17, 22 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,853,987 to Cook ("Cook"), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,747 to Inohara et al. ("Inohara"), and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,281,811 to Ranzino ("Ranzino"). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended and now recites: *[a] communication system comprising:*

*line connection means for connecting lines between communication terminal devices;*

*communication management means for managing communication between the communication terminal devices through said line connection means;*

*information supply means for supplying advertisement information to said communication management means;*

*information distribution means, provided in said communication management means, for distributing the advertisement information to a corresponding communication terminal device; and*

*privilege assignment means, provided in said communication management means, for assigning a privilege to a user of the communication terminal device to which the advertisement information is distributed,*

*wherein said corresponding communication terminal device comprises keyword extraction means for extracting a keyword by recognizing a voice of said user, wherein the keyword is used by said user in a conversation with another user, and*

*wherein said information distribution means selects a particular advertisement information from among plural pieces of said advertisement information based on an extraction result by said keyword extraction means, and supplies said particular advertisement information to said corresponding communication terminal device.*

Applicant's claimed invention accommodates the supply of particular advertisement information from a plurality of potential advertisement based upon an extraction of a keyword recognized from usage in a conversation between a user and another user. Additionally, the user is provided with privileges for receiving advertisement information that is distributed to the user.

In this regard, various features recited in independent claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references relied upon by the Examiner. Cook discloses a centralized authorization and fraud prevention system for computer networks, such as for transactions between a customer and a merchant. The system uses an account code for identifying rights. A database stores the account code, an account number, and a signature phrase that is stored when rights to use the account have been positively identified. The customer can complete an e-commerce transaction without requiring the signature phrase or account code to be provided to the merchant. (Cook, Abstract).

As noted by the Examiner, Cook does not disclose communication management means, information distribution means, keyword extraction means, or the selection of information based upon a keyword extraction result as claimed by Applicant. (Office Action , p. 3). Applicant concurs, but also submits that Cook fails to disclose or suggest the distribution of advertisement information as recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, contrary to the contention by the Examiner, Cook does not disclose a privilege assignment means that assigns a privilege to a user of the communication terminal device based upon distribution of advertisement information to that user. The authentication system 18 of Cook is a computer system resident on a network node that facilitates the disclosed authentication processing for accommodating e-commerce transactions between customers and merchants. There is no assignment of a privilege in the fashion claimed by Applicant, particularly a privileged based upon the receipt of distributed advertisement information.

Inohara does not remedy the deficiencies of Cook. Inohara discloses an information processing system and corresponding method of managing distributed servers. In the Inohara system, servers form a multi-cast hierarchy that is dynamically reconstructed through mutual support and communication related to the hierarchy. This is said to relieve administrative burdens related to the management of cooperation between servers. Applicant respectfully submits that Inohara offers no disclosure or suggestion of the above-described features. Again,

there is no mention of the distribution of advertisement information even generally by Inohara,
nor is there any disclosure or suggestion of selecting a particular advertisement based upon an
extraction result involving the extraction of a keyword that is used by a user in a conversation
with another user. Nor is there any disclosure or suggestion in Inohara of the privilege
assignment features claimed by Applicant and noted as being absent from Cook. Accordingly,
several features of amended claim 1 are not disclosed of suggested by Cook and Inohara, even in
combination.

Ranzino also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Cook and Inohara. Ranzino discloses a
system that allows a user to locate herself in an area such as a shopping mall or theme park.
Ranzino uses a command based approach. A user states a keyword into a microphone of a
headset that is worn while he or she is in the area, and the system responds with information of
interest related to the resource of interest in proximity to the user's location. (Ranzino,
Abstract). For example, as described in connection with FIG. 4, the user speaks the request into
the microphone. The system detects the request and the user location, determines resources
corresponding to the location and returns voice signals corresponding to the determined
resources to the user. (Ranzino, FIG. 4, 4:31-67).

While potentially useful for navigating a theme park or the like, the Ranzino system
differs from Applicant's claimed invention and thus the reference also fails to disclose various
claimed features described above. First, in contrast to amended claim 1, Ranzino does not
recognize a keyword that is extracted from a conversation between the user and another user.
Rather, the Ranzino system is more command-oriented, allowing a single user to speak into a
microphone in search of particular information for the area that the single user is navigating.
Additionally, amended claim 1 recites the supply of a particular advertisement to the user based
upon the conversation-extracted keyword. Ranzino does not disclose the provision of
advertising information generally and thus cannot be said to disclose or suggest selection of
particular advertisements as claimed by Applicant. Finally, as with Cook and Inohara, there is
no disclosure or suggestion in Ranzino of a privilege assignment means that assigns a privilege
to the user based upon distribution of the advertisement information. Again, since the reference
does not generally disclose distribution of advertisement information, it cannot be said to
disclose or suggest the assignment of privileges corresponding to such distribution.

Since Cook, Inohara, and Ranzino, whether considered alone or in combination, would

still fail to yield features recited in Applicant's claims, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to produce a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Applicant's claim 1.

For reasons similar to those provided regarding claim 1, claims 3, 11, 17 and 25 are also neither disclosed nor suggested by the relied upon references, alone or in any combination. Claims 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, 22-24, and 26-27 depend from respective independent claims and thus incorporate these features that are absent from the references, in addition to their own separately recited, distinct features.

Applicant also notes that a proper motivation to combine these references remains absent. There would be no valid reason for the artisan to be motivated to modify the fraud preventing authentication system of Cook according to the network management system of Inohara and the communication and location system of Ranzino. There is no evidence of record to support a conclusion that the artisan would be motivated to combine these three clearly divergent approaches in the fashion contemplated by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara, and further in view of Ranzino.

Claims 5, 13 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara and Ranzino, and further in view of U. S. Pat. No. 5,757,788 to Tatsumi et al. ("Tatsumi"). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 5, 13 and 19 respectively depend from independent claims 3, 11 and 17, and thus incorporate features that are not disclosed or suggested by Cook, Inohara and Ranzino as described above. Particularly, there is no disclosure or suggestion of "privilege assignment means for assigning a privilege to a user of one of said communication terminal devices to which the advertisement information is distributed," or "extracting a keyword by recognizing a voice of said user, wherein the keyword is used by said user in a conversation with another user," or selecting and supplying "a particular advertisement information from among plural pieces of said advertisement information" based upon the extracting, as recited in independent claim 3.

Tatsumi offers no disclosure nor any hint or suggestion regarding any of these claimed features. Instead, Tatsumi discloses a digital radio communication system and corresponding techniques for transmitting audio and non-audio data. There is no disclosure of privilege

assignment, keyword extraction, or selection of a particular advertisement based upon the same, as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant notes that even the introduction of this fourth reference would still fail to yield a *prima facie* case of obviousness for dependent claims 5, 13 and 19, which incorporate the above-described features. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara, Ranzino and Tatsumi.

Claims 6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara and Ranzino, and further in view of U. S. Pat. No. 6,704,294 to Cruickshank ("Cruickshank"); claims 9, 16, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara and Ranzino, and further in view of U. S. Pat. No. 6,519,463 to Tendler ("Tendler"); claims 18 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara and Ranzino, and further in view of U. S. Pat. No. 6,736,726 to Miura ("Miura"); and claims 20,27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Inohara and Ranzino, and further in view of JP409233193 to Funusako ("Funusako"). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, and 27 variously depend from the above-described independent claims and thus incorporate features that are absent from Cook, Inohara and Ranzino, even in combination. Cruickshank, Tendler, Miura and Funusako are variously relied upon for purported disclosure of dependent claim features, but also fail to disclose or suggest the features recited in the respective independent claims. Specifically, Cruickshank, Tendler, Miura and Funusako each fail to disclose or suggest privilege assignment based upon distribution of advertising information, extracting a keyword from a conversation between the user and another user, or selecting a particular advertisement based upon the extracted keyword as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant notes that the introduction of these references would also fail to yield Applicant's claimed invention, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the claims which remain in
the application are solicited.   If any further issues remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone
the undersigned to resolve them.


Dated: *April 24, 2006*                        Respectfully submitted,

                                               By_____
                                               Ronald P. Kananen
                                                  Registration No.: 24,104
                                               Christopher M. Tobin
                                                  Registration No.: 40,290
                                               Attorney for Applicant


**RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC**
Lion Building
1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501
Washington, D.C.  20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No.  23353

DC212754